

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Art Unit: 2136
Victor L. Andelin Confirmation No.: 6471
Application No.: 10/666,929
VIA ELECTRONIC FILING
Filed: September 18, 2003
For: Digitally Watermarking Documents
Associated With Vehicles
Examiner: D. CERVETTI
Date: July 19, 2010

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellants respectfully request the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereafter the “Board”) to reverse the outstanding final rejection of the pending claims.

This Appeal Brief is in furtherance of a Notice of Appeal filed December 17, 2009, and is responsive to the final Office Action mailed August 25, 2010 (hereafter referred to as the “final Office Action”). Please charge the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(f) and any other fees needed to consider this Appeal Brief to our deposit account no. 50-1071.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	3
STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	3
SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	3
GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	6
ARGUMENT	6
<i>Rejections under U.S.C. 102(e) over the Wu patent</i>	6
Claim 35 (and dependent claims 38 and 42)	6
Claim 40	8
Claim 41	8
<i>Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over the Wu patent</i>	9
Claim 22	9
Claim 25	11
<i>Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over the Wu patent in view of the Bunn patent</i>	11
Claims 36 and 37	11
<i>Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over Tresser in view of the Wu patent</i>	12
Claim 14	12
Claim 17	13
Claim 26	13
Claim 31	15
Claim 32	16
Claim 39	16
CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR REVERSAL	17
CLAIMS APPENDIX	18
EVIDENCE APPENDIX	26
RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	27

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Digimarc Corporation of Beaverton, Oregon.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 14-48 are pending. Claims 1-13 are canceled in the concurrently filed Amendment accompanying Appeal Brief.

Each of the pending claims stands finally rejected and is on Appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment Accompanying Appeal Brief is filed concurrently herewith. All previously-filed amendments have been entered.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Each of the claims recites at least one steganographic element. Steganography includes the art or science of hiding auxiliary data in a host signal. One form of steganography is digital watermarking [*see, e.g.*, page 1, line 22]. Digital watermarking hides data through, e.g., slight alterations to data [*see, e.g.*, page 2, lines 13-29].

Claim 35 recites a printed document comprising: a document identifier; a first digital watermark including a first payload [*see, e.g.*, page 9, lines 11-13; *see also, e.g.*, page 1, line 22 – page 2, line 29], the first payload comprising a representation of the document identifier [*see, e.g.*, page 9, lines 15-19]; a second digital watermark including a second payload, the second payload comprising at least a reduced-bit representation of the first payload [*see, e.g.*, page 9, lines 13-14 and 19-20; *see also, e.g.*, page 1, line 22 – page 2, line 29].

Claim 40 recites that the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a hash [*see, e.g.*, page 9, lines 11-14].

Claim 41 recites that the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a cryptographic permutation [see, e.g., page 23, original claim 23].

Claim 22 recites a method to authenticate documentation associated with a motor vehicle, the documentation comprises plural-bit auxiliary data steganographically embedded therein through alterations to graphics, artwork or information carried on the documentation [*see, e.g.,* page 2, lines 13-29], the auxiliary data comprising at least an identifier [see, e.g., page 5, lines 5-20; *see also* page 10, line 15-17]. The method comprises: receiving optically captured image data that corresponds to the documentation; utilizing a configured multi-purpose electronic processor, analyzing the image data to obtain the identifier, wherein the identifier includes or links to information to uniquely identify the motor vehicle; and providing a signal in response to the identifier being obtained [see, e.g., page 10, line 15 – page 11, line 2].

Claim 25 recites the method of claim 22, wherein the information further comprises a listing of drivers who are authorized to operate the motor vehicle [*see, e.g.,* page 10, lines 24-26]

Claim 36 recites the document of claim 35, wherein the document is associated with a motor vehicle [*see, e.g.,* page 8, line 6].

Claim 37 recites the he document of claim 36, wherein the document identifier comprises a vehicle identification number (VIN) [*see, e.g.,* page 9, line 22-25].

Claim 14 recites a method of providing authenticating information for a property title document [*see, e.g.,* Fig. 2], said method comprising: receiving a first digital signature that is associated with a seller of property [*see, e.g.,* page 12, line 26 – page 13, line 10; *see also, e.g.,* Fig. 2]; receiving a second digital signature that is associated with a buyer of the property [*see, e.g.,* page 12, line 26 – page 13, line 10; *see also, e.g.,* Fig. 2]; using the first digital signature and the second digital signature to provide a digital watermark payload, the payload comprising authenticating information [*see, e.g.,* Fig. 2; *and see, e.g.,* page 13, lines 11-17]; and steganographically embedding the digital watermark payload in the property title document [*see, e.g.,* Fig. 2; *and see, e.g.,* page 13, lines 17-19; *see also, e.g.,* page 1, line 22 – page 2, line 29].

Claim 17 recites authentication information comprising an output of a function which includes the first digital signature and the second digital signature as inputs [*see, e.g.,* page 13,

lines 14-16].

Claim 26 recites a method to facilitate transfer of a motor vehicle from a seller to a buyer [*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3], the method including: receiving into a first data record information associated with the motor vehicle or the seller of the motor vehicle [*see, e.g.*, page 14, lines 21-25; *see also, e.g.*, Fig. 3]; providing the buyer of the motor vehicle with a digitally watermarked object, the digital watermark comprising an identifier [*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3 (“Buyer’s Card”); *see also, e.g.*, page 14, line 26 – page 15, line 1]; associating the identifier with a second data record, the second data record including information associated with the buyer of the motor vehicle [*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3 (“Buyer’s Card”); *see also, e.g.*, page 14, line 26 – page 15, line 1]; associating the first data record with the second data record [*see, e.g.*, page 15, line 1-6; *see also, e.g.*, Fig. 3]; upon presentation of the digitally watermarked object, receiving optically captured scan data representing the digitally watermarked object, and analyzing the scan data to obtain the identifier [*see, e.g.*, Fig. 3; *see also, e.g.*, page 15, lines 6-10], said method further comprising accessing at least the second data record via the identifier [*see, e.g.*, page 15, lines 10-19; *see also, e.g.*, Fig. 3].

Claim 31 recites automatically notifying at least a government agency after the buyer confirms the transfer [*see, e.g.*, page 15, lines 20-23].

Claim 32 recites that a motor vehicle is purchased through an auction [*see, e.g.*, 14, lines 18-25].

Claim 39 recites the document of claim 35, wherein the second digital watermark is imparted to the document through laser engraving [*see, e.g.*, page 8, lines 26-27].

The above specification citations should not be construed as limiting claim scope, as other examples will fall within the scope of these claims. Additional and alternative support can be found throughout the application as well.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 35, 38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,533 (hereafter referred to as “the Wu patent” or simply as “Wu”).
2. Claims 22-25 and 39 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wu.
3. Claims 36-37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,907,528 (hereafter referred to as “the Bunn patent” or simply as “Bunn”).
4. Claims 14-21 and 26-34 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. US 2002-0073010 A1 (hereafter referred to as “the Tresser publication” or simply as “Tresser”) in view of Wu.

ARGUMENT***Rejections under U.S.C. 102(e) over the Wu patent*****Claim 35 (and dependent claims 38 and 42)**

Independent claim 35 recites:

*35. A printed document comprising:
a document identifier;
a first digital watermark including a first payload, the first payload comprising a representation of the document identifier;
a second digital watermark including a second payload, the second payload comprising at least a reduced-bit representation of the first payload.*

The Wu patent does not have each and every element of claim 35; namely, it does not have a second digital watermark payload including at least a reduced-bit representation of a first digital watermark payload.

It is well settled that in order for an Office Action to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as required by the claim, must be found in a single prior art reference, either expressly or under the principles of inherency. *See generally, In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1997); Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc., 850 F.2d 675, 677-78 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984).*

The final Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation since the Wu patent does not have each and every element of claim 35; namely, it does not have a second digital watermark including a second payload, where the *second payload includes at least a reduced-bit representation of the first payload.*

The Office Action cites Wu at Col. 6, lines 35-67, as anticipating these features. *Please see the final Office Action, page 6, paragraph 22.*

We respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art will disagree.

The cited Col. 6 Wu passage discusses obtaining information from one portion of a document and encoding that information in a watermark encoded in another portion of the document.

For example, at Wu's Col. 6, lines 47-56, a facial image is printed on a first portion of a document. A facial recognition method is used to extract invariant features from the facial image. These features are coded and encrypted as input for a watermark generator. A watermark is printed onto a second portion of the product.

Another example, at Wu's Col. 6, lines 57-67, uses another biometric feature (e.g., a printed picture of the owner's fingerprint) for an input into a second watermark generator. The second watermark is printed onto a third portion of the document.

These examples do not anticipate claim 35 since they do not have the necessary correspondence between two different watermark payloads. In particular, they do not have a first watermark payload comprising a representation of the document identifier, and a second digital watermark including a second payload, where the *second payload includes at least a reduced-bit representation of the first payload.*

We additionally note that Wu teaches away from the combination in claim 35. For example, in Wu's abstract, Wu teaches that his watermarks should be generated "independently." This cuts against the interrelated watermark payloads as in claim 35.

The final rejection of claim 35 should be reversed since it does not have each and every element of claim 35 as arranged therein.

Claim 40

Dependent claim 40 recites:

40. *The document of claim 35, wherein the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a hash.*

The final Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation since it does not have each and every feature of claim 40 as arranged therein.

As discussed above with respect to claim 35, Wu's second digital watermark does not include information from a first watermark, let alone a hash of the first payload.

We respectfully request the final rejection of claim 40 be reversed.

Claim 41

Dependent claim 41 recites:

41. *The document of claim 35, wherein the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a cryptographic permutation.*

The final Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation since it does not have each and every feature of claim 41 as arranged therein.

As discussed above with respect to claim 35, Wu's second digital watermark does not include information from a first watermark, let alone a cryptographic permutation of the first watermark payload.

We respectfully request the final rejection of claim 41 be reversed.

Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over the Wu patent

Claim 22

Independent claim 22 recites:

22. A method to authenticate documentation associated with a motor vehicle, the documentation comprises plural-bit auxiliary data steganographically embedded therein through alterations to graphics, artwork or information carried on the documentation, the auxiliary data comprising at least an identifier, said method comprising:

receiving optically captured image data that corresponds to the documentation;

utilizing a configured multi-purpose electronic processor, analyzing the image data to obtain the identifier, wherein the identifier includes or links to information to uniquely identify the motor vehicle; and

providing a signal in response to the identifier being obtained.

Claim 22 recites – in combination with other features – a method to authenticate documentation associated with a *motor vehicle*. The Office Action cites to Wu's abstract of “scan watermark to determine authenticity” for the steps of receiving, analyzing and providing. See the final Office Action, page 7, last paragraph – page 8, line 5.

One of ordinary skill in the art will disagree with the sufficiency of this rejection.

Wu's abstract is provided below for convenience:

A method, an apparatus and a computer program product are disclosed for protecting the legitimacy of an article (100), and in particular an electronic document, against forgery or fraud. Such articles include passports, credit cards, bank notes, lottery tickets, secure forms. The method includes the following steps:

several watermarks (204, 224, 244) are generated independently (304, 306, 308) by different cryptographic watermarking mechanisms controlled utilising information permanently associated within the article or product (100); and each watermark is embedded in a linked cryptographic manner (160, 162, 164). Subsequently, the watermarks can be scanned and digitised (410). The authenticity of the article (100) can be determined by verifying the correctness of extracted watermarks and the encryption links (160, 162, 164) among them. Also disclosed is a method of embedding an invisible watermark (714) in an official seal (712) incorporated in an electronic article or document (700).

As seen above, there is no discussion in Wu's abstract of analyzing the image data to obtain the identifier, wherein the identifier includes or links to information to uniquely identify the motor vehicle; and providing a signal in response to the identifier being obtained. Thus, the final Office Action overstates the significance of Wu's abstract.

The Office Action further states that Wu does not disclose documentation associated with a motor vehicle comprising such features, however, "*these features have been admitted per applicant to have been conventional and well known at the time the invention was made.*" See the final Office Action, page 8, lines 6-8. To be clear, we expressly traverse this statement.

The final Office Action does not cite to applicant's alleged admissions. This type of rejection cuts against the sound advice in the MPEP. For example, MPEP § 706.02(j) states: "[T]he examiner should set forth in the Office action: (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate...." This is because "[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply." See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant has been denied a fair opportunity to reply on the record since the final Office Action makes sweeping statements regarding admissions without citing support.

The rejection of claim 22 fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness since it overstates the significance of the Wu abstract, and fails to give applicant a fair opportunity to reply on the record. Thus, we respectfully request that the final rejection of claim 22 be reversed.

Claim 25

Dependent claim 25 recites:

25. *The method of claim 22, wherein the information further comprises a listing of drivers who are authorized to operate the motor vehicle.*

Recall that the “information” in claim 25 is carried by or linked to steganographic embedded data (e.g., a digital watermark). In addition to information to uniquely identify the motor vehicle (claim 22), claim 25 recites that the information further comprises a listing of drivers who are authorized to operate the motor vehicle.

The cited Wu passages at Col. 5-6 (see the final Office Action, page 9, under “Regarding claim 25”) seem interested in verifying or authenticating. We do not see steganographic embedded data including or linking to information including a listing of drivers who are authorized to operate the motor vehicle.

Thus, the final Office Action overstates the significance of Wu relative to claim 25. We respectfully request the final rejection of claim 25 be reversed.

Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over the Wu patent in view of the Bunn patentClaims 36 and 37

Dependent claims 36 and 37 recite:

36. *The document of claim 35, wherein the document is associated with a motor vehicle.*
37. *The document of claim 36, wherein the document identifier comprises a vehicle identification number (VIN).*

The final Office Action, at page 10, paragraph 25, states the following reasoning for combining Wu with Bunn:

“Bunn teaches wherein the document is associated with a motor vehicle / wherein the document identifier comprises a vehicle identification number (VIN) (col. 3, lines 2-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Wu’s teaching on the system of Bunn. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide multiple watermarks to motor vehicle related documents (Bunn, col. 3).”

This is a classic example of hindsight bias. That is, since Bunn teaches a document including a VIN, it would have been obvious to combine with Wu. This type of reasoning is only constructed with hindsight bias. Thus, the reasoning is improper and reflects “the distortion caused by hindsight bias.” Please see KSR, slip op. at 17.

We respectfully request the rejection of claims 36 and 37 be reversed.

Rejections under U.S.C. 103(a) over Tresser in view of the Wu patent

Claim 14

Independent claim 14 recites:

14. *A method of providing authenticating information for a property title document, said method comprising:*

receiving a first digital signature that is associated with a seller of property;

receiving a second digital signature that is associated with a buyer of the property;

using the first digital signature and the second digital signature to provide a digital watermark payload, the payload comprising authenticating information; and

utilizing a configured multi-purpose electronic processor, steganographically embedding the digital watermark payload in the property title document.

Claim 14 recites using the first digital signature and the second digital signature to provide a digital watermark payload, the payload comprising authenticating information; and steganographically embedding the digital watermark payload in the property title document.

The final Office Action states that Wu at Col. 5-6 teaches these features. See the final Office Action, page 11, lines 3-8.

The undersigned has carefully read these Wu passages and cannot find any disclosure of using digital signatures to provide a digital watermark payload. (The Examiner is invited to cite specific lines in the Answer if the undersigned has overlooked the intended passages.) As discussed above under claim 35, Wu uses information from a first portion of a document (e.g., a facial image) as input for a watermark to be embedded in a second portion of the document.

Thus, the final Office Action overstates the significance of Wu, and a combination of Wu and Tresser, even if combined as suggested, would not render obvious Claim 14.

Claim 17

Dependent claim 17 recites:

17. The method of claim 14, wherein the authentication information comprises an output of a function which includes the first digital signature and the second digital signature as inputs.

The cited Wu passage at Col. 6-7 (see the Office Action, page 12, lines 1-3) is not understood to use multiple different inputs to form a digital watermark payload (e.g., the authentication information). Instead, these passages seem to disclose using a signal input (information from a facial image or information from a fingerprint image) to a watermark generator.

Thus, the Office Action overstates the significance of Wu relative to claim 17. We respectfully request that the final rejection of claim 17 be removed.

Claim 26

Independent claim 26 recites:

26. A method to facilitate transfer of a motor vehicle from a seller to a buyer, said method comprising:

receiving into a first data record information associated with the motor vehicle or the

seller of the motor vehicle;

providing the buyer of the motor vehicle with a digitally watermarked object, the digital watermark comprising an identifier;

associating the identifier with a second data record, the second data record including information associated with the buyer of the motor vehicle;

associating the first data record with the second data record;

upon presentment of the digitally watermarked object, receiving optically captured scan data representing the digitally watermarked object, and analyzing the scan data with a configured multi-purpose electronic processor to obtain the identifier, said method further comprising accessing at least the second data record via the identifier.

Claim 26 recites different and separate features relative to claim 14. Nevertheless, the final Office Action lumps together these two claims in its analysis. See the final Office Action, page 10, paragraph 26 – page 11, line 14.

Thus, the final Office Action failed to even address at least the following acts of claim 26:

- *receiving into a first data record information associated with the motor vehicle or the seller of the motor vehicle;*
- *providing the buyer of the motor vehicle with a digitally watermarked object, the digital watermark comprising an identifier;*
- *associating the identifier with a second data record, the second data record including information associated with the buyer of the motor vehicle;*
- *associating the first data record with the second data record; and*
- *upon presentment of the digitally watermarked object, receiving optically captured scan data representing the digitally watermarked object, and analyzing the scan data with a configured multi-purpose electronic processor to obtain the identifier, said method further comprising accessing at least the second data record via the identifier.*

The final rejection of claim 26 should be reversed since the final Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness by failing to even address the many features of claim 26.

Claim 31

Dependent claim 31 recites:

31. The method of claim 30, further comprising automatically notifying at least a government agency after the buyer confirms the transfer.

The final Office Action acknowledges that Tresser and Wu do not disclose the features of claim 31. See the final Office Action, page 13, line 6-8. So the final Office Action alleges that “*these features have been admitted per applicant to have been conventional and well known at the time the invention was made.*” See the final Office Action, page 13, lines 6-8. To be clear, we traverse this statement.

The final Office Action does not cite to applicant’s alleged admissions. See Id. This type of rejection cuts against the sound advice in the MPEP. For example, MPEP § 706.02(j) states: “[T]he examiner should set forth in the Office action: (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate....” This is because “[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.” See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant has been denied a fair opportunity to reply on the record since the final Office Action makes sweeping statements regarding admissions without citing support.

The rejection of claim 31 should be reversed.

Claim 32

Dependent claim 32 recites:

32. *The method of claim 26, wherein the motor vehicle is purchased through an auction.*

The final Office Action acknowledges that Tresser and Wu do not disclose the features of claim 32. See the final Office Action, page 13, line 6-8. So the final Office Action alleges that “*these features have been admitted per applicant to have been conventional and well known at the time the invention was made.*” See the final Office Action, page 13, lines 6-8. To be clear, we traverse this statement.

The final Office Action does not cite to applicant’s alleged admissions. See Id. This type of rejection cuts against the sound advice in the MPEP. For example, MPEP § 706.02(j) states: “[T]he examiner should set forth in the Office action: (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate....” This is because “[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.” See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant has been denied a fair opportunity to reply on the record since the final Office Action makes sweeping statements regarding admissions without citing support.

The rejection of claim 32 should be reversed.

Claim 39

Dependent claim 39 recites:

39. *The document of claim 35, wherein the second digital watermark is imparted to the document through laser engraving.*

The final Office Action acknowledges that Wu [and Tresser] does not disclose the features of claim 39. See the final Office Action, page 9, last 3 lines. So the final Office Action alleges that “*these features have been admitted per applicant to have been conventional and well known at the time the invention was made.*” See the final Office Action, page 9, last 3 lines. To be clear, we traverse this statement.

The final Office Action does not cite to applicant’s alleged admissions. See Id. This type of rejection cuts against the sound advice in the MPEP. For example, MPEP § 706.02(j) states: “[T]he examiner should set forth in the Office action: (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate....” This is because “[i]t is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.” See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant has been denied a fair opportunity to reply on the record since the final Office Action makes sweeping statements regarding admissions without citing support.

The rejection of claim 39 should be reversed.

CONCLUSION AND REQUEST FOR REVERSAL

Appellants respectfully request the Board to reverse the final rejection of the pending claims.

Date: July 19, 2010

Customer No. 23735

Telephone: 503-469-4685
FAX: 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By: Steven W. Stewart, Reg. No. 45,133/
Steven W. Stewart
Registration No. 45,133

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1 – 13. canceled.

14. (previously presented): A method of providing authenticating information for a property title document, said method comprising:

receiving a first digital signature that is associated with a seller of property;

receiving a second digital signature that is associated with a buyer of the property;

using the first digital signature and the second digital signature to provide a digital watermark payload, the payload comprising authenticating information; and

utilizing a configured multi-purpose electronic processor, steganographically embedding the digital watermark payload in the property title document.

15. (original): The method of claim 14, wherein the authentication information comprises the first digital signature and the second digital signature.

16. (previously presented): The method of claim 14, wherein the authentication information comprises a cryptographic permutation of at least one of the first digital signature or the second digital signature.

17. (original): The method of claim 14, wherein the authentication information

comprises an output of a function which includes the first digital signature and the second digital signature as inputs.

18. (original): The method of claim 14, wherein at least one of the authentication information, first digital signature and second digital signature comprises a time or date stamp.

19. (previously presented): The method of claim 14, wherein the property comprises at least one of a motor vehicle, personal property or real property.

20. (previously presented): The method of claim 14, wherein the authentication information comprises a reduced-bit representation of at least one of the first digital signature or the second digital signature.

21. (previously presented): The method of claim 14, wherein the property title document comprises at least one of an electronic document or a printed document.

22. (previously presented): A method to authenticate documentation associated with a motor vehicle, the documentation comprises plural-bit auxiliary data steganographically embedded therein through alterations to graphics, artwork or information carried on the documentation, the auxiliary data comprising at least an identifier, said method comprising:

receiving optically captured image data that corresponds to the documentation;

utilizing a configured multi-purpose electronic processor, analyzing the image data to obtain the identifier, wherein the identifier includes or links to information to uniquely identify the motor vehicle; and

providing a signal in response to the identifier being obtained.

23. (original): The method of claim 22, wherein the identifier is intertwined with another identifier, the another identifier being steganographically embedded in different documentation, the different documentation also being associated with a motor vehicle.

24. (previously presented): The method of claim 22, wherein the documentation comprises at least one of an emissions document or sticker, a license plate, an insurance card, disabled placard, cab or taxi documentation, a trip permit, a cargo manifest, a registration document, an inspection sticker or document, or a motor vehicle title.

25. (original): The method of claim 22, wherein the information further comprises a

listing of drivers who are authorized to operate the motor vehicle.

26. (previously presented): A method to facilitate transfer of a motor vehicle from a seller to a buyer, said method comprising:

receiving into a first data record information associated with the motor vehicle or the seller of the motor vehicle;

providing the buyer of the motor vehicle with a digitally watermarked object, the digital watermark comprising an identifier;

associating the identifier with a second data record, the second data record including information associated with the buyer of the motor vehicle;

associating the first data record with the second data record;

upon presentment of the digitally watermarked object, receiving optically captured scan data representing the digitally watermarked object, and analyzing the scan data with a configured multi-purpose electronic processor to obtain the identifier, said method further comprising accessing at least the second data record via the identifier.

27. (original): The method of claim 26, further comprising accessing the first data record.

28. (original): The method of claim 27, wherein the first data record and the second data record are associated via the identifier.

29. (original): The method of claim 27, further comprising presenting at least some of the information that is associated with the motor vehicle or the seller of the motor vehicle to the buyer through a computer interface.

30. (original): The method of claim 29, further comprising prompting the buyer to confirm the transfer through the computer interface.

31. (original): The method of claim 30, further comprising automatically notifying at least a government agency after the buyer confirms the transfer.

32. (original): The method of claim 26, wherein the motor vehicle is purchased through an auction.

33. (original): The method of claim 30, wherein the information associated with the buyer comprises an account number, said method further comprising automatically debiting the account after the buyer confirms the transfer.

34. (original): The method of claim 33, further comprising generating a printed title document after the buyer confirms the transfer.

35. (original): A printed document comprising:

a document identifier;

a first digital watermark including a first payload, the first payload comprising a representation of the document identifier;

a second digital watermark including a second payload, the second payload comprising at least a reduced-bit representation of the first payload.

36. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the document is associated with a motor vehicle.

37. (original): The document of claim 36, wherein the document identifier comprises a vehicle identification number (VIN).

38. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the document comprises information printed therein, and wherein said second payload further comprises a representation of at least a portion of the printed information.

39. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the second digital watermark is imparted to the document through laser engraving.

40. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a hash.

41. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the reduced-bit representation of the first payload comprises a cryptographic permutation.

42. (original): The document of claim 35, wherein the document comprises variable information printed thereon, and wherein the second digital watermark comprises at least some of the variable information, wherein the variable information varies from document to document.

43. (previously presented): A programmed computing device storing instructions in memory, said instructions are executable by said programmed computing device to perform the acts of claim 14.

44. (previously presented): A computer readable media comprising instructions stored thereon to cause a multi-purpose electronic processor to perform the acts of claim 14.

45. (previously presented): A programmed computing device storing instructions in memory, said instructions are executable by said programmed computing device to perform the acts of claim 22.

46. (previously presented): A computer readable media comprising instructions stored thereon to cause a multi-purpose electronic processor to perform the acts of claim 22.

47. (previously presented): A programmed computing device storing instructions in memory, said instructions are executable by said programmed computing device to perform the acts of claim 26.

48. (previously presented): A computer readable media comprising instructions stored thereon to cause a multi-purpose electronic processor to perform the act of analyzing recited in claim 26.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

(No Evidence)

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

(No Related Proceedings)